

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-14 are pending.

Independent Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to clarify the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention. The amendment is supported by applicants' specification, for example, page 6, lines 5-7. No new matter is believed to be added by the present amendment.

Claim 15 is newly added and finds support from the specification page 5, line 13 through page 6, line 7. No new matter is entered.

Rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Chin et al. (US Pat No 5,617,421) (hereinafter Chin)

Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed below, claim 14 is not anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Chin

Applicant's claim 14 include a memory for storing routing table data, said routing table data comprising data representative of at least a bus identifier.

The Office Action points to Chin col. 13, table 1; col. 14, table 2; col. 16, table 4; and col. 11, lines 35-38 as showing applicant's claimed feature (both in the rejection of claim 14 and claims 1 and 2, which recite the bus identifier). However, nowhere does Chin disclose routing data including a bus identifier.

Chin discloses domains, for example VN in the tables 1, 2 and 4, however domains are not the same as bus identifiers. As disclosed in Chin col. 2, lines 6-24 domains are across and include several segments. In other words a domain includes several segments and does not identify a segment. Applicants contend the segments are not equivalent to applicants' claimed bus, however, even if they were equivalent Chin does not teach a segment identifier. Thus a domain does not identify a segment and cannot be the same as a bus identifier.

Furthermore, in Chin col. 6, lines 61-67, the interswitch links are described as internal buses inside the switching fabric circuit. Such buses are also not identified by a unique bus identifier. The switches are routing packets between LAN segments (such as segment. A1, B1, C1...) and not communication buses.

For at least the foregoing reasons Chin does not disclose any communication network comprising buses connected by bridges, each bus being

identified by a unique bus identifier. Because Chin fails to disclose each and every feature in applicants' claim 14, Chin cannot anticipate the claimed invention and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin in view of Civanlar et al. (US Pat No 6,078,963) (hereinafter Civanlar).

Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed below, claims 1-11 and 13 are not obvious under 35 USC 103(a) over Chin in view of Civanlar.

Applicant's claim 1 include routing table data comprising data representative of at least a bus identifier.

The Office Action points to Chin col. 13, table 1; col. 14, table 2; col. 16, table 4; and col. 11, lines 35-38 as showing applicants' bus identifier as recited in the preamble of claim 1 and to Chin as showing the transmitting step. However, it is respectfully submitted the combination of Chin and Civanlar fail to disclose at least the claimed routing data including a bus identifier.

As pointed out above, Chin discloses domains, which are different from bus identifiers. As disclosed in Chin col. 2, lines 6-24 domains are across and include several segments. Thus a domain cannot be the same as a bus identifier because a domain cannot identify a bus. Also, in Chin col. 6, lines 61-67, the interswitch links are described as internal buses inside the switching fabric circuit. Such buses are also not identified by a bus identifier. The switches are routing packets between LAN segments and not communication buses.

Civanlar discloses routers utilizing RIP, OSPF or BGP and relating to layer 3 as defined by OSI. As pointed out by Civanlar col. 3, lines 53-65, the routing tables related to IP packet addresses and router port identification. Civanlar col. 3 line 66 to col. 4, line 7 points out that the IP packet addresses relates to OSI layer 3. Nowhere does Civanlar teach the buses are identified by a bus identifier.

Because the combination of references, Civanlar and Chin fail to teach at least a network communication bus with bus identifier the rejection should be withdrawn. Claim 1 is non-obvious over Chin in view of Civanlar.

Furthermore, the dependent claims 2-13 are likewise non-obvious over the combination of references because each claim includes the features of claim 1

from which they depend and because each claim includes additional distinguishing features.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin in view of Civanlar and further in view of Oechsle.

Claim 12, depends ultimately from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the foregoing reasons as discussed with regard to claim 1.

In addition claim 12 recites paths of greater length being deleted from the routing table. Oechsle describes the selection for routing is performed among the shortest path but there is no teaching that paths of greater length being deleted from the routing table. Oechsle only describes selecting the shortest path.

The combination of Chin, Civanlar and Oechsle fail to teach applicants' claimed features recited in claim 12 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

Yvon Legallais et al.

By: 
Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing LLC
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 2/26/07